

IFW



PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 1165-936

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
Toru Morita et al.)	Group Art Unit: 1711
)	
Application No.: 10/525,452)	Examiner: Duc Truong
)	
Filed: February 24, 2005)	
)	
For: Polyketone Fibers and Process for)	Confirmation No.: 5745
Producing the Same)	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION

In reply to the Restriction Requirement of May 24, 2007, applicants elect Group I and claims 1-7, 20-21, 23, and 24 for further prosecution in this application with traverse.

Applicants understand the requirement for restriction between Groups I, II, and III. However, applicants do not understand why claim 22 of Group IV cannot be examined with the claims of the elected group because it depends from elected claim 20 or 21. Thus if claims of the elected group are allowable, it is not seen why claim 22 should not also be considered allowable.

At the very least, once a claim of Group I is considered allowable, since claim 22 is a claim dependent from it and would include all of its limitations, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn and the claim rejoined in this case in accordance with

the practice of M.P.E.P. §821.04(a). As noted in this section of the M.P.E.P., "Claims that require all of the limitations of an allowable claim will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 104."

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 25, 2007

By: 

Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338
Tel: 202-408-4091

1389469_1.DOC